

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

April 25, 2017

1. Call to Order.

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of Minutes.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES asked for correction to the minutes of the general faculty meeting on August 31, 2016. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved.

3. Report of the President.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES reported there would be 13 commencement ceremonies across 8 campuses. There are 8,604 graduates across the system, the largest in the system history. There are 6,939 graduates from the Columbia campus. United Nations Secretary General António Guterres will deliver a commencement address on the 6th of May, Saturday in the afternoon.

Students and alumni of the university have received more national fellowships at any point in USC history. Seventy-six students have either received or advanced to the finalist round of the distinguished scholarships that most universities track. Forty-five have earned post graduate scholarships. The award winners have earned more than \$2,231,000 to continue their academic studies for their research and scholarly engagement.

USC's 10th Rhode Scholar, Jory Fleming, and his canine assistant Daisy, will be going to Oxford. Last week he was recognized at the State House.

This spring marks twenty-five consecutive years of Goldwater Scholars at the University. There is a nomination limit of four from the entire university and this year three of them prevailed with one more as an honorable mention. Sixteen consecutive years for Fulbright Student finalists.

Applications for admission to USC are healthy - over 25,000 to fill a class of approximately 5,300 freshmen. The great basketball success of the university impacted the number of applications submitted. The yield is higher than anticipated but we still hope to enroll a freshmen class of approximately 5,300. The university has a strategic but moderate plan for growth that raises the freshman class by only 100 a year until it reaches approximately 6,000 and then it will plateau, given the resources both in terms of faculty, staff personnel, housing, classrooms, and technology.

Friday was the inauguration of Discover USC day. There were over 1,000 presentations. Nobel Laureate Dr. Shuji Nakamura was the key note speaker — he was responsible for the development of blue LED light.

On the topic of international student travel, USC has signed on with APLU (Association of Public and Land Grant Universities), asking the administration to think twice about the policy that restricts students from 7 countries originally and then 6 countries in the second iteration where Iraq was dropped from that list. It is being held up by the courts so the ban is not in effect at the current time. Those 6 countries are Iran, Libya, Syria, Yemen, Sudan and Somalia. USC has 67 students from Iraq, 54 from Iran, 7 from Libya, and 2 from Syria, none from Yemen, Sudan or Somalia. There are 1,789 international students at USC Columbia.

USC is closer than it's been in a long time to a bond bill. A bond bill, simply put, is an opportunity for the state, based on its good credit rating, to go into the bond market where banks will formulate bonds, depending on how much money is to be borrowed. The university pays them back at historically low interest rates. Right now legislators don't appear to be in favor of passing it. The governor decided that the bond bill would be better to fix roads rather than raise the gas tax. The gas tax, of course, is subsidized by out of state travelers who drive through this state. About 40% of every dollar raised in the gas tax is paid for by out of state travelers, so it would be a pretty good deal for South Carolinians. Pastides had an editorial today in the *Charleston Post and Courier* co-written with the President of the Technical College system, Tim Hardy, asking legislators to consider an override of the Governor's threaten veto of the higher education bond bill.

Foundation Square is complete, a beautiful park-like area with a lot of granite and benches, as well as the 1801 Grille. The Student Health Center is nearly complete. One of the greatest surprises of Pastides' presidency is how many students there are in need. They are in need of support, in need of counseling, in need of advising, in need of mental health, in need of physical support and the old health center just clearly had run out of space to do that.

The School of Law is just about completed now and the law school library will move first. It will begin moving next week with the rest of the move in period to occur this summer.

Campus Village which is probably the last, new living learning residential complex to be built for a while on the south campus has also been approved with support by both the city council and the county council. USC currently has a request for proposals out from a private partner developer who will put up the building on USC land and who will operate it for a certain number of years. The President thanked the community, the neighbors, the neighborhoods who worked with USC over concerns of increased traffic and parking in the area. That area of south campus currently houses roughly 900 students but when the village is done it will house in brand new buildings 3,700 students. No room stock will be taken off until new buildings are added. This is about a 5-year program of construction until it is done.

USC has had a number of distinguished speakers on campus. They include Francis Ford Coppola, who had a standing room only crowd at the Russell House theatre; Pulitzer Prize winner David Leonhardt; Yale Law School Dean Robert Post, who spoke about constitutional freedom of expression on college campuses while balancing the right of all groups of students and others on campus to feel safe; and Eva Schloss, who had a full house at the Koger Center. There aren't that many Holocaust survivors left. She was 15 while incarcerated at Auschwitz and she's in her 90s now. The crowd was largely a young crowd - students in high school and

middle school, teachers and others. She spoke thoughtfully and poignantly about her experience but always with the point being the lessons in the story, not so much “what happened to me.”

Last week Maestro Donald Portnoy who has been conductor of the USC Symphony for 31 years, was presented with the *Order of the Palmetto* on the stage of the Koger Center at intermission.

4. Report of Provost.

PROVOST JOAN GABEL stated the name of the new health center is the Center for Health and Well Being.

Last summer USC developed a faculty hiring rubric that helps quantify faculty need in terms of current and projected teaching and other metrics of research and diversity. The Provost’s Office then works with deans, who work with faculty to layer in the human element of where there may be hiring opportunities. During this year’s hiring season, USC hired 7 tenure, 62 tenure-track and 93 non-tenure track faculty. They processed 84 USC-Columbia and 7 Palmetto College T&P files, 17 sets of unit criteria; 20 non-tenure track promotion files; 76 family friendly requests, 29 endowed chair appointments, reviews and reappointments and multiple retention offers.

The office worked with an ad hoc committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee on a host of proposed revisions to the Faculty Manual including working in partnership with Faculty Senate on non-tenure track faculty policies.

The Provost’s Office conducted the third year of Pipeline for Academic Leadership. Sixteen USC faculty and 9 senior staff went through this program. The program was covered in the Chronicle [of Higher Education] and USC was identified as a university that is a thought leader on making an investment in the professional development of its faculty.

Internal grants were expanded this year to include full-time non-tenure track faculty and a track for pedagogy. Over the past six years, these grants have supported the development and/or completion of 102 books, 78 journal articles, 29 performances, 86 graduate students and countless presentations and the development of new courses. There are about 45-50 projects under review right now across five program areas.

Out of the Provost’s Office there have been four dean searches:

Cheryl Addy who is Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School
Sandra Kelly who is Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies
College of Social Work, Sarah Gehlert will be joining USC from Washington University. And she starts on July 1st.

Finalists are on campus, last week and this week, for Information and Communications.

USC hired a new CIO - Doug Foster from Purdue.
Tena Crews from HRSM is replacing Kris Finnegan.
An active search is ongoing for the CTE Director.

The Health Sciences Arena has been underway now for about a year. The initial phase is primarily targeted at recruiting students into the undergraduate student population who would then continue into various graduate programs in the Health Sciences field. The main tangible attribute of this initiative has been the Galen Fellows, which is a group of students who've come into a living-learning community devoted to students interested in careers in health sciences and health professions. David Simmons was recently named as the principle for that living-learning community. Currently, there are 300 beds for those students, however, due to the additional 200 requests for the program, we are trying to accommodate all 500.

The Provost gave an update on the campus wide investment on high performance computing. A governance process was set up for the deployment of funds towards high performance computing. There was \$1.25M in one-time money to invest in the acquisition. There are reoccurring monies to keep the system going and to occasionally make additions or updates to the cluster. A representative committee was formed of faculty, staff and administration who advised the Provost. She then worked with the CIO, both former and current, on deploying those recommendations. The HPC cluster was delivered on April 19th.

There are 224 compute nodes, 6 GPU nodes, 8 large-memory nodes, and 2 management nodes that were acquired at a discounted price with the assistance of Phil Moore in UTS. They have a performance rating of 308 Teraflops. The committee under Mark's leadership has very graciously moved on to analysis of data management and storage which goes hand-in-hand with the ability to engage in computing. A proposal has been submitted for payment.

Some Diversity and Inclusion Updates – The collaborative on Race and Reconciliation is continuing with the Welcome Table South Carolina. The Welcome Table South Carolina is a program that engages small groups of students, faculty and staff using stories as a means for acknowledging or understanding how race affects our lives. It's had about 100 members of the community participate. Their work was featured in a National story in NPR about Susan Glisson who was the program's founder. In a few weeks CNN will feature a story about Welcome Table South Carolina in an expanded article on the same topic. If you are interested in participating, John Dozier is your primary point of contact on that.

The university purchased an institutional membership for the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity also called NCFDD. This is an independent professional development training and mentoring community that was brought to the administration's attention, largely, in conversation with the Black Faculty Caucus. USC has 129 members who participated.

The Faculty and Staff Climate survey wrapped up last month; results are being analyzed and findings will be made available.

Last year, the Provost's Office asked all the deans to hire an associate dean within their unit, as the Chief Diversity Officer. This position has now been filled within the colleges and they meet the third Friday of every month. These officers have been organized into four sub-committees that meet in between the collective meetings. The four areas are: Faculty Recruitment and Retention, Data Collection and Reporting, Climate Assessment and Engagement and Training.

Additionally, Diversity and Inclusion under the President's leadership and the Board of Trustees has received approval of language for two plaques that acknowledge the contributions of enslaved people to the university. The first plaque will speak to the Slave Quarters behind the President's House and it will read:

This last remaining kitchen and slave quarters on campus stands as a tangible link to the enslaved people who lived and worked here. South Carolina College, forerunner to the modern university, owned a number of slaves and hired countless others between 1801 and 1865. Enslaved people made significant contributions to the construction and maintenance of college buildings and to daily life on campus. Despite limited references to individuals, enslaved workers who appear by name in archival records include Abraham, Amanda, Anna, Anthony, Charles, Henry, Jack, Jim, Joe, Lucy, Mal., Peter, Sancho and his wife, Simon, Toby, and Tom. Naming these individuals is an effort to remember all of those who made significant and substantial contributions to the University of South Carolina.

The second plaque speaks more broadly to the contributions of enslaved workers and reads:

The Horseshoe, the original campus of the University of South Carolina (established in 1801 as South Carolina College), still appears much today as it did in the mid-1800s. Its buildings and historic wall were substantially constructed by slave labor and built of slave-made brick. Enslaved workers were essential to the daily operations of the college, whether they were owned by the faculty or the college itself, or hired from private citizens. Enslaved people lived in outbuildings, one of which still stands behind the President's House. The University of South Carolina recognizes the vital contributions made by enslaved people.

This language went from the faculty through committee and to the Board of Trustees and has been approved. The location is still being reviewed by Buildings and Grounds.

The Provost gave an update on the status of the Strategic Refresh of the Focus Carolina Strategic Plan. Input was gathered from Town Halls, retreats, CAD, and individual meetings with faculty. The 7 goals have been taken down to 5 although in substance they are the same goals. They are just framed more in how we are articulating the strategic priorities of the university. Work is underway now on objectives and action items and how to look at measures. This update resulted from an update of the blueprints submitted by the colleges.

The Provost launched floating office hours this year and attended several faculty and departmental meetings. She went to all the academic units at least once this year to do one-on-one feedback.

The Provost announced the 2017 Faculty award winners:

Educational Foundation Award for Outstanding Faculty Service was Tan Ye.

Russell Award for Research in Science, Mathematics & Engineering was Qian Wang.

Educational Foundation Award for Research in Science, Mathematics & Engineering was Kevin Huang.

Educational Foundation Award for Research in Health Sciences was James Carson.

Russell Award for Research in Humanities & Social Science was Paula Feldman.

Ada B. Thomas Outstanding Staff Advisor was Renee McGinnis and our Ada B. Thomas Outstanding Faculty Advisor was Gwen Geidel

Clinical Practice Teaching Award winners were Sabra Custer and Julie Justo.

Michael J. Mungo Graduate Teaching Award winner was David Wethey.

Michael J. Mungo Undergraduate Teaching Award winners were as Sourav Banerjee, David L. Barbeau, Ralf Gothe and Mindi Spencer.

Michael J. Mungo Distinguished Professor of the Year was Clifford Leaman.

5. Reports of Committees.

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science and Engineering) - presented three sets of proposed changes to the *Faculty Manual*. All of these changes have been approved by appropriate committees and by the Senate as a whole, and all of them are available on the website for this meeting. The first set of changes consists of small changes mainly originating from the Provost Office, housekeeping changes, and they are things like capitalization errors, rephrasing for clarity, rewording to conform to approved language. For example the Information Technology Committee is actually officially called the Faculty Senate Information Technology Committee, so that's rewording and some rewording to conform to current practice or policy.

The second set of changes extends voting rights to non-tenure track faculty members and the third set of changes is the new procedure for hardship withdrawals that proved for inclusion in the undergraduate bulletin by the Faculty Senate at the December 7, 2016 meeting. The first two sets of changes were approved by the Faculty Senate on April 12th and the last one was approved on March 1st.

Valtorta moved for approval of these changes to the *Faculty Manual*. The floor was opened for discussion.

PROFESSOR CHRIS WITKO (Political Science) - stated a lot of people in his department were concerned about extending voting rights to non-tenure track faculty. He understands the motivation behind it and there is a good reason to try to get non-tenure track faculty more involved potentially involved in governance. However, he and a lot of his colleagues in the Political Science department don't think this is the way to do it.

One concern is that people who don't have tenure, are not on the tenure track, are never going to be on the tenure track, being involved in faculty governance decisions related to things like academic freedom, defense of tenure itself, that they're not necessarily going to see things in the same perspective as tenure track faculty and in fact not be as vigorous as defending academic freedom and faculty governance and that's a major concern.

The other concern exists that what this will do in effect is further shift power within the institution to units that have a disproportionate percentage and number of non-tenure track faculty. That isn't a good thing necessarily either and as a member of the College of Arts and Sciences he is concerned their voice is not what it could be in recent years compared to some of these other units. He will vote against it.

PROFESSOR RICHARD SHOWMAN (Biological Sciences) – stated he supported Witko's comments. The sciences in particular are very concerned about this, voted very much against this proposal as it currently stand. They are strongly in favor of it with amendments but the amendments have not been considered in a way that they think is appropriate. He would therefore request that all three of the motions be separate and discussed and dealt with as separate votes not as a group.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - stated that could be done.

PROFESSOR JANET HUDSON (Extended University) – stated that she served on the Faculty Welfare Committee that conducted the original survey that lead to this recommendation and she wanted to inform the two faculty members from Arts and Sciences that the greatest plea for this change came from faculty in their college.

PROFESSOR EVA MONSMA (Physical Education) - is also on the Faculty Advisory Committee and wanted to speak in favor of this motion and to clarify some ideas that the speakers brought up. At first glance, being a full professor she would be concerned too, regardless of whether someone is full or not if they're on a tenure track. The Committee has vetted this within the Faculty Senate, have accounted for the disproportionality within the colleges - for example the two Medical Schools are restricted to having three faculty senators to represent the masses of non-tenure track faculty there. They also have put in provision specifications so that the issues that may oversee tenure track faculty, so voting on files for example and all of those things are precluded from any of this. So the types of things that come up at Faculty Senate might be something to consider and of course tenure is not one of those things. For those who are thinking about that kind of thing, no decisions are ever really made regarding that stuff at the Faculty Senate, and that's what they are really talking about - they aren't talking about extending votes to the committee of 24 for example.

PROFESSOR SIMON TARR (School of Visual Art and Design) - To address the second part of this proposal and augmenting the two prior faculty. Speaking as someone who has a unit with many non-tenure track faculty that are critical and as someone who as an 18-year partner who is one of those people he knows very well the results of the morale findings that the Faculty Advisory committee. Yet he still wants to strongly recommend that the faculty vote against this. It is easy to mistake this as a referendum on the value of non-track faculty and it is easy to go

along with it's often portrayal as a referendum on democratic ideals but there are still significant problems with this that are not addressed enough by some of the changes that did come forward. This proposal will dramatically alter shared governance by changing the faculty side of the governance model; it will do that by definition.

The role of the faculty needs to be isolated from administrative pressure, to one where voting members, and this proposal will change it to one where the faculty side of that shared governance equation will not be insulated. They will be vulnerable to political trends and to pressure from anyone who might be able to determine funding from year to year. And the rebuttal to this argument is often and regularly to indicate that indeed junior faculty are to serve in the senate and that they are under political pressure as well, but, however he doesn't see that as quite a fair comparison. The rigor of the tenure process simply is not comparable to the "at will" nature of short term contract positions, it's just not.

Term employees are only long term continuing by the grace of the administrative units under which they serve and that can change very dramatically, very quickly. They only have to look to the current political climate to imagine a very believable situation and look at other states to envision a future legislature that might be so hostile to any given line on inquiry or any given line of distasteful orthodoxy against their orthodoxy to envision to even shut it down. It would be trivial at that point to so dramatically shift the constitution of the faculty so that it would be very vulnerable. It seems very unwise particularly given that there were other remedies put forward by the Faculty Advisory Committee that were excellent and that were not done seeing the results of those are. Example, extending contracts for longer terms. For example, extending awards and other competitive grants to non-tenure track faculty. These are excellent suggestions and no one has assessed that success yet. Before they have figured all this out faculty are faced with a very dramatic change that could fundamentally alter the constitution of this body, so he strongly recommends voting against it.

PROFESSOR NATHANIEL BELL (Nursing) - first thanked the Faculty Advisory Committee for all of their questions and time that they have had from many discussions. He asked if the meeting had a quorum.

PARLIAMENTARIAN BILL SUDDUTH (University Libraries) - Under Roberts Rule of Order, a meeting of the general faculty is considered a mass meeting so therefore the quorum is those in attendance.

PROFESSOR MARK COOPER (English) - spoke strongly in favor of the proposal. There are good reasons for supporting it and it's worth saying what some of those are. One is the democracy argument for sure that people ought to have a say in decisions that affect them. That's a principle he would like to see broadened in our organizations, in our work places and he thinks the university ought to be a place that shows organizations how to broaden that principle. But he can understand that some might not be interested in that argument so there's also a practical argument which is organizations tend to work better when people feel they have a say in decisions that affect them. Certainly the studies about the campus climate that lead to this proposal indicated very strongly that people would feel more committed to decision making around here if they had a chance to have a say.

He also spoke on the academic freedom argument; the way to defend academic freedom isn't by sheltering it, trying to circle the wagons tighter and tighter around it. The way to defend academic freedom is by protecting its exercise, extending its exercise. So while he's sympathetic to this argument of administrative pressure, the question his colleagues should ask themselves is "a Faculty Senate that has voices of non-tenure track faculty represented within it more or less likely to extend procedures, to develop procedures like the one Professor Tarr just indicated to protect faculty from those pressures when they exist." Academic freedom is not the only topic that Faculty Senate discusses. There are lots of ordinary business like parking that affects everyone. Faculty would benefit from other voices in those conversations. He urged to vote in favor.

PROFESSOR BRAD EPPERLY (Political Science) – stated he is one of those untenured people who foolishly says things, and so it's clear the pressure isn't so onerous but that's because he's on the tenure track and knows that if he were to be punished for saying things there would be a significant process to protect him in doing so. The argument for democracy, as someone who studies democracy, is to him incomparable. Who the voters are and who the citizens are is defined by a community and it's defined by a community in a variety of ways. He is entirely sympathetic to the idea that non-tenure track faculty feel that they are less valued than tenure track faculty but extending service obligations to them seems to be the least meaningful thing to make them feel appreciated. Perhaps giving them job security and better pay would be the first thing to do and this feels like a lot to deal with the fact that there are fundamental unfairnesses towards the sort of adjunctification of the university.

Finally with things like parking, that logic of extending democracy has no reason to say it should only extend to non-tenure track faculty. Why don't students serve on the Faculty Senate? There are many decisions here that affect them. They are often in some sense more tied to the university in a longer-term sense than non-tenure track faculty who as have been noted, serve at will and find out often times a month before if they will continue their presence on campus. The nature of faculty governance is supposed to be strong faculty who are able to resist and to influence the goals and priorities of and in the administration and as it's been noted there are significant pressures that have been put in place for those who do not have the protections of tenure or even the tenure track.

He also suggested that the nature of the last faculty meeting, which did not have a significant number of attendees, and this passed through was surprising to very many people and regardless of the nature of whether it follows Roberts Rules of Order. It is questionable in a democratic sense to have a handful of voters deciding something that affects all of the faculty and that they should all have a say. He got a ballot in the mail last week to determine who is on the tenure and promotion committee and that went to every single faculty in the university. That seems to be a much less significant long term and massive change to how the faculty governance operates and yet all faculty got a ballot. So it seemed to him that the process as well could follow more democratic means if that's what we really care about.

PROFESSOR GWEN GEIDEL (Earth, Ocean and Environment) - is a non-tenure track faculty member. She spoke highly in favor of allowing non tenure track faculty the opportunity to vote

in Faculty Senate. She was a member of the faculty senate task force that looked at this issue, that reviewed the data that was out there on non-tenure track faculty and especially how disenfranchised they feel across campus and how their morale is low. Within the last two years USC has lost two very significant research faculty to other institutions because they felt they only have one-year contracts and they felt they were not valued on this campus. If USC wants to grow as a research institution, we need to understand the value of those faculty as well as how we can embrace them and want them to stay here.

She has been fortunate to have a long career at here at Carolina; she's been here for more than 30 years as a non-tenure track. She's had the opportunity to be an Associate Dean of the School of the Environment, and a Director of an Environment and Sustainability program. While she has not dealt directly with tenure and promotion she has certainly valued faculty that are in the tenure track and in that position and have had to talk on their behalf in her various capacities. Non-tenure track faculty have the ability to value tenure track faculty, understand that they are very valuable to the university but at the same time non-tenure track really also need to be engaged and one of the ways that they can be engaged is to recognize that they have a value to the university. One way to do that is to allow them to vote.

PROFESSOR JESSE KASS (Mathematics) - is a tenure track faculty member and spoke to the issue of feeling comfortable voting. The senate votes publicly saying yea or nay, and as someone who is going up for tenure this year, since there been a lot of emotional language both in favor of this motion and in favor of not passing the motion, he felt a little uncomfortable stating his vote publicly and asked if a written ballot could be used.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - There are three options - a voice vote which preserves the anonymity of individuals; a raise your hand vote which does not but which would be preferable if the voice vote is not conclusive; and an even more anonymous vote if that is required. The President stated he is neither a partisan on this issue or a participant in it. He chairs the general faculty, this is a recommendation from Faculty Senate to the general faculty. There will be a vote, however, that is the legislative directive of the university this is a quorum therefore of the general faculty. He leaves it up to the voters to decide how.

PROFESSOR DENISE MCGILL (Journalism) - If someone has any concern about their security she would strongly prefer a ballot vote so that everyone feels comfortable with that.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - asked if anyone objected to a ballot vote. There were no objections.

PROFESSOR JIM BURCH (Epidemiology) - stated he is generally in favor of representation of non-tenure track faculty here. He is also very sympathetic to the comment that was made about the democracy of the process. He noted there were a lot of empty chairs at the meeting and asked if it was possible for a ballot vote to be sent to all faculty.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES replied that it was a rather late request, and is not ordinarily the way that the general faculty votes on issues that are recommended to it by the Faculty Advisory Committee through the Faculty Senate. He asked Parliamentarian Bill Sudduth for input.

PROFESSOR BURCH - asked if it could be made as a motion and he would make it a second.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - replied he didn't know if he had the right to cancel the vote today to go to a general university-wide faculty vote.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - moved that it be put to a vote of the full faculty tenured and tenure track.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - replied he didn't know if that is that an acceptable motion.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - asked for the motion to be restated.

PROFESSOR BURCH - moved that the second amendment that is up for discussion today be put to a vote of the full tenure and tenured track faculty of the university by a written ballot vote.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - restated that Burch was requesting that for the second proposal the vote be taken by ballot, distributed to the whole faculty. Sudduth asked for a second and discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - asked if non-tenure track faculty are allowed to vote on this particular issue in this body because there are non-tenure track faculty here too.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - asked for clarification on who would be voting today at the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - stated he was one of the people in the beginning was kind of against this proposal because the ratio of tenure and other tracks but (inaudible) he thinks they do have to give some rights to non-tenure track faculty. Waiting for the perfect solution will just keep it being prolonged and it's time to give them some rights in this situation. So he votes in favor of this although he does have some questions also but he's going in favor of this.

PROFESSOR JOAN CULLEY (Nursing) - called for a point of order, stating she thought they were only discussing this motion. It would seem that under the bylaws of Faculty Senate these things are to be brought to the general faculty meeting so it would require a change to the bylaws in order to take this to the full faculty. She recommended that they proceed with the vote in paper ballot as they just voted for, unless they want to amend the bylaws.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - The bylaws are not specific about how the faculty votes on proposals coming from Faculty Senate. There is a motion that it be done by ballot and that is what we are discussing.

PROFESSOR CULLEY - And that was seconded and approved is that correct?

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - No there's been no vote on that so they are speaking to the matter of whether to refer the voting on either proposal two or all three by some mechanism where by

anonymity can still be secured. The President didn't know whether that is allowed under the bylaws, but if it does not they can go forward with that vote by a paper ballot.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - Point of clarification, there's nothing in the *Faculty Manual* for electronic voting and the motion does say by paper ballot.

PROFESSOR COOPER - asked if the motion on the table pertains only to the second of the three proposals the proposal to extend voting rights to non-tenure track faculty and it is to have a vote by paper of the full currently voting faculty.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - confirmed the statement.

PROFESSOR COOPER - pointed out that this has been on the agenda for several faculty meetings for months. It has been in the works for a year or more. There have been a series of reports. This faculty meeting was properly publicized with this item on the agenda. There has been plenty of time, classes are over, for the faculty who cared about this issue to show up to a meeting and speak about it. He suggested that the empty chairs might indicate that this might be of less general concern to the faculty than some people in this room have suggested so he sees no reason to change the customary protocols of the general faculty meeting and he believes we should defeat this motion to have an extraordinary ballot.

PROFESSOR WITKO - Actually a lot of people might not have class right now but they certainly do have obligations that they need to be at including his colleague who has to go and give a presentation. The Department of Political Science has a undergraduate awards ceremony very soon that their faculty would like to go to attend as well. There are people involved in setting that up and things, that have to be there who would've come here for certain. So if major changes are going to be major changes to the *Faculty Manual*, when it has been done at other institutions at which he's taught, it was always been done by a ballot sent around to everybody and as his colleague said it's done that way for membership on these committees that nobody cares about at all.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - asked if the faculty there wanted to take a vote about whether to defer this to a vote of the general faculty by paper ballot and if they preferred a voice vote, show of hands, or paper ballot. Voice vote was acceptable.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - stated he still had that question about whether this is this open for non-tenure track to vote on because there are non-tenure track faculty at the meeting.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - They will not vote.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - asked if they knew who are non-tenure track.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - replied they know who they are and he didn't think anyone would imply that people who shouldn't vote will be voting. That's an added affront that will weigh in on the ultimate vote. They will show courtesy to everybody here and Bill Sudduth will inform attendees who is eligible to vote. A motion has been made and seconded to not vote today on

proposal number two but to have a paper ballot of the entire eligible to vote faculty at a later time but they are going to take a vote on the first matter. He asked Sudduth who gets to vote today on that matter.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - This is a meeting of the faculty at the University of South Carolina. All members of the faculty at the University of South Carolina may vote.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - Asked that in the paper ballot as well if that group were to prevail is that also true that in that vote there would be participation by all members of the Carolina faculty. In the general faculty it may be that they have the right to vote. That's what the Parliamentarian is looking at now. This is a meeting of the general faculty.

PROFESSOR CULLEY - Point of order, there is already a motion on the floor that's been seconded to vote by paper ballot; something has to be done with this motion.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - That's the motion. The motion is who can vote on that, that's the question that has been raised, who votes on that motion.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - stated he at present is answering what is considered a point of order as to who is eligible to vote in this situation. The membership of "the faculty consists of the president, provost, and deans; professors, associate professors, and assistant professors; full-time academic instructors and full-time lecturers who are not degree candidates in the units of their appointments; clinical and research professors; visiting faculty and emeriti professors; librarians; and such other persons as the faculty chooses to elect to its ranks" *Faculty Manual* (Page 4, Membership).

Voting, "The following members of the faculty shall have the right to present motions and vote at meetings of the university faculty: the president; the provost; deans; tenure-track faculty; librarians; and fulltime ROTC faculty. Full-time faculty may exercise the right to vote during temporary absences from the university, such as sabbaticals or leaves of absence. However, voting by proxy is not permitted at meetings of the university faculty. Individuals who hold research faculty appointments are not voting members of the university faculty." That is in the Faculty Manual page 4.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - So full time faculty including instructors. It specifically precludes research faculty but not other teaching faculty who are not on the tenure track.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - Correct. Is restricted to tenure track faculty, those on the tenure track. So only those who are on the tenure track including other officers mentioned may vote on this motion.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - Voting yea on this motion implies that they will defer this vote to a paper ballot of the general faculty at a later time. Voting nay means that they will continue and vote on proposal two as well as proposals one and three today. Yea means defer, nay means go forward.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - (Inaudible)

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - There is no reason not to go forward quickly with a paper ballot if that's the result.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - (Inaudible)

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - That's a different matter. The President did not want to get in to that because it gives credence to the idea that that will happen, and it may be a moot point. He asked if there were any reason not to go forward with a voice vote now on whether to defer to vote on proposal two or whether to continue with the vote today.

PROFESSOR CHARLIE ADAMS (Public Health) - also served on the task force that worked on this language. If in fact that this means they are going to let the general faculty vote this academic year that is a problem. At least the people in this room have somewhat informed opinion. Those on the general faculty would not be afforded that opportunity to hear all sides of the issue.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - appreciated the comment but it is a moot point right now that could be a discussion following the vote.

The President asked if there were any other comments about this motion that has been made and seconded to defer the vote. All in favor of deferring the vote to a paper ballot of the general faculty say yea, all opposed say nay? The result was unclear so a vote by raising of hands was held. The results were Yea-29 Nay-35 so the meeting continued. The three proposals would be voted on individually and would be read again.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA - Number one is the housekeeping changes, these are minor changes on many pages of the *Faculty Manual* including capitalization errors, rephrasing for clarity, rewording to conform to approved language, and rewording to conform to current practice or policy. The proposal was approved.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA - Proposal number two is to extend voting rights to non-tenure track faculty members as a special case the clinical teaching faculty of each School of Medicine will have three elected representatives only.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - asked if a paper ballot was requested. It was and he instructed tenure track faculty to mark yea to approve the second proposal or nay to vote against it.

Ballots were collected. As they were being counted the third proposal was read.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA - The third proposal is a modest set of changes that derives from the new procedure of hardship withdrawal. This procedure was approved for inclusion in the *Undergraduate Bulletin* by the Faculty Senate on a proposal from the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petition on December 7, 2016 and the changes to the *Faculty Manual* that derived from that rather substantial set of changes those were approved on March 1st. Again the change

to the *Faculty Manual* is truly modest here it was something that was noticed after the bulletin was changed.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES - The proposal was seconded and the President called for a voice vote. The proposal was approved.

The paper ballot results on the second proposal were ayes 35 to nays 30. The proposal passed.

6. Old Business.

There was no old business.

7. New Business/Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR STEVE RODNEY (Physics and Astronomy) - announced the university's efforts to prepare for the total solar eclipse on August 21, 2017. He invited everyone to join and participate as they are looking for students, faculty, creative ideas. There is an event coming up very soon it's a good chance to get connected. He provided flyers for a colloquium hosted jointly by the Department of Physics and Astronomy and the Department of Geography. There is also a mailing list.

8. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next meeting of the General Faculty will be held on Wednesday, September 6, 2017, at 2:00 p.m. in the Booker T. Washington Auditorium.